

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 15 2006

REMARKS

Claims 11-17 and 22-27 have been allowed.

Claims 1-3 and 5-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended above to overcome this rejection.

Claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Leistner (US 5,762,190). Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Nakata et al. (US 4,955,476). Claims 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hickman (US 5,499,724). The examiner is requested to reconsider these rejections.

The examiner stated that for the purposes of examination the examiner was treating claim 1 as if no die pin was positively recited. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that a die pin is being positively recited. Claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Leistner or Nakata et al. or obvious in view of the art of record. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable and should be allowed.

Though dependent claims 2-3 and 5-10 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 1. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Claim 18 has been amended above to clarify applicant's claimed invention. Claim 18 claims that the die pin comprises a first section protruding outward from the first side and a second

section protruding outward from the second side. The die pin is adapted to receive a die on the first and second sections to hold the die on the holder at the first and second sides. The features of claim 18 are not disclosed or suggested in the art of record. Hickman does not disclose or suggest that the pins 7 comprises a first section protruding outward from a first side of the frame member 3 and a second section protruding outward from an opposite second side of the frame member 3, wherein the pin 7 is adapted to receive a die on the first and second sections to hold the die on the frame member 3 at the first and second sides.


In regard to the examiner's statement regarding the language "adapted to", In re Hutchison holds that the term "adapted to" used in the preamble is not given patentable weight. However, In re Venezia 189 USPQ 149 (CCPA 1976) explicitly held that the phrase "a pair of sleeves *** each sleeve of said pair adapted to be fitted over the insulating jacket of one of said cables" imparts a structural limitation to the sleeve. The court went on to hold that the language "adapted to be affixed" and "adapted to be positioned" also defines present structures or attributes of the part which limits the structure of the housing. Thus, it appears that In re Hutchison only applies to the preamble of a claim, not the body of a claim. The features of claim 18 are not disclosed or suggested in the cited art. Therefore, claim 18 is patentable and should be allowed.

Though dependent claims 19-21 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 18. However, to

expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are patentable over the cited art. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,


Mark F. Harrington (Reg. No. 31,686)

9/15/06
Date

Customer No.: 29683
Harrington & Smith, LLP
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
203-925-9400

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

9/15/2006
Date


Name of Person Making Deposit